

ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE  
Forty-eighth Legislature – Second Regular Session

**ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE**

Minutes of Meeting  
Thursday, May 14, 2009  
Senate Hearing Room 1 -- 1:30 p.m.

Chairman Maguire called the meeting to order precisely at 1:30 p.m. and attendance was noted by the secretary.

**Members Present**

Dr. John Baracy  
Jim Di Cello  
Margaret Dugan  
Dr. Eugene Garcia

Johanna Haver  
Eileen Klein  
Karen Merritt  
Anna Rosas  
Alan Maguire, **Chairman**

**There was a full complement of members present; there were no absentees.**

A quorum was present for the purpose of conducting business.

**Approval of the March 12, 009 Minutes of Task Force Meeting**

**Mr. Di Cello moved, seconded by Dr. Baracy, to approve the minutes of the March 12, 2009 Task Force meeting, with the following conditions:**

- 1.) Correction of duplication of Dr. Garcia's name.
- 2.) Review of page 2, paragraph 6, last sentence for a possible correction.

**The motion carried.**

**Review/Discussion and Possible Action on Proposed Alternative Model:  
Window Rock Unified School District**

Presentation was made by the following personnel from the Window Rock Unified School District (WRUSD):

- Dr. Joy Grant Manus, Principal/Sawmill Elementary School
- Roberta Tayah, Principal/Tsehootsooi Middle School

- Carena Begay, Dean of Students/Window Rock High School
- Karen Daychild, 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher/Window Rock Elementary
- Susan Stucker, English Language Learner (ELL) Coordinator

Dr. Manus provided her background and educational history. In addition, she noted that she is part Navajo and part Omaha and knows the challenges of English acquisition first hand.

Presentation's Background Information: She noted that educators at a school district must know their students, and know them well, and know their community. This helps to meet their students' needs and provide service; this is especially important for Native American students.

She noted that few, if any, Native Americans students enter school not knowing how to speak English. Navajo students come to school speaking English already, but many do not speak "perfect English." Dr. Manus stated that federal law requires that educational services must be provided to American Indian students as they continue language development. She noted that their schools have students identified as ELL, and others not classified as such but who still have challenges with English. She stated that with the WRUSD alternate model, having Navajo-speaking students together with their non-ELL peers is beneficial to all of them in terms of learning standard English, learning to read and write academic text, and learning more English vocabulary.

She noted that the WRUSD alternate model allows students to be with other students with similar needs as they further develop their English language skills.

She stated that WRUSD has never attempted to bypass the law as it applies to English Language Learners. Dr. Manus said that, "The law states that we can adopt an ELL program that is not based on a model adopted by the task force. Based on this, we have created a model that works for our students, as opposed to utilizing ELL plans selected for us, which we feel are inappropriate and do not meet our students' backgrounds and needs."

Karen Daychild spoke next and provided her background and educational history. She noted that she has worked with the WRUSD alternate model for almost two years. This model allows ELL students to mix with non-ELL students of similar educational needs and clustered in a grade-level classroom.

According to Ms. Daychild: "This is the second year I've had to implement this program, and can say how effective it has been." She noted that last year, her class started out with 13 ELL students; a combination of teaching them with the four hours, participating in professional development classes in Structured English Immersion (SEI) and English Language Development (ELD) teaching strategies, resulted in (by year's end), nine of the 13 students testing out as proficient. She noted that in this year's clustered classroom, she has six ELLs out of 25 students; five of these have now tested out as proficient. In her analysis of WRUSD data, she noted gains in all six areas tested.

She noted that in the WRUSD cluster model, the ELL and non-ELL students cooperated and interacted, and that in fact the non-ELL students acted as role models, both in academic content areas and in oral English development.

Principal Roberta Tayah spoke next.

Ms. Tayah described the school under her charge, Tsehootsooi Middle School, and provided various statistics. She noted that her 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade school is partially implementing the WRUSD model, using a multi-disciplinary team approach. Eight teams are used, with two teams per grade level. Ms. Tayah noted that the structure is as follows: There are “A” and “B” teams, with the “A” teams focused on the ELL students. ELL students are served by the “A” teams’ Highly Qualified (HQ) teachers with any/all of these endorsements: English as a Second Language (ESL), Bi-Lingual (BLE), Structured English Immersion (SEI).

ELL students (in “A” team status) are mixed with non-ELL students with similar educational needs.

She noted that in a previous Task Force meeting, in July 2008, she had stated that (at that time) Tsehootsooi Middle School was serving 63 ELL students. The previous year, the ELL count was at 100. Presently, this year, there are 30 ELL students. Ms. Tayah stated that since the count has gone from 100 to 63 to 30 (in successive school years), that the design of the WRUSD model is working at her school. As stated, “Our numbers are definitely decreasing.” She noted that what they are doing is: ...”working for us, working to benefit our students as well”.

Carena Begay spoke next.

She provided her background and educational history. Ms. Begay thanked the Task Force for the opportunity to speak.

As Dean, Ms. Begay had to implement the four-hour model for her high school students. She stated, “This four-hour model has been implemented into our eight-hour class schedule this school year”. An interdisciplinary team was formed, consisting of English, science and social studies teachers. In addition, the school also developed classes by clustering ELLs and non-ELLs (at grade-level) with similar educational abilities and needs. Also developed were three English classes, consisting of two-hour blocks per class, for grades 9 and 10 and “cross grades 11 and 12”.

Ms. Begay further noted that they developed two science classes as a reading class (one hour each): “as a reading class, for one hour each”, with “cross grades 9 and 10, and 11 and 12”. Similarly, they developed two social studies classes as a writing and grammar class (one hour each), with “cross grades 9 and 10, and 11 and 12”.

She noted that teachers assigned to these classes have dual certification, and they have a background of ESL or SEI endorsements, for teaching the ELD classes. The four-hour implementation has been a challenge but successful for students in improving their English language skills and abilities.

She then ceded the floor to Dr. Manus, who spoke in her capacity as principal

Dr. Manus noted that her school is one of the smallest and most rural in WRUSD, with less than 20 ELLs in the entire student body. The grade span is K-5, and (because on the small numbers in any three-grade span), they use Individual Language Learner Plans (ILLPs). All teachers are HQ and SEI-endorsed. She stated that using the ILLPs was successful, and they reclassified many ELL students.

Ms. Susan Stucker spoke next.

Ms. Stucker provided her background and educational history, noting that she was the first and only ELL coordinator in WRUSD.

She noted that she had presented the WRUSD proposed alternate model to the Task Force twice before, at the April 10, 2008 and July 10, 2008 meetings, respectively. Ms. Stucker emphasized that WRUSD is delivering four hours of ELD daily to their students, and: “would like to draw your attention to our cumulative as well as our current ELL data.” She called the Task Force members’ attention to her handouts, and noted the downward trend in ELL program members. From a high of 1,500 in 2003 to 179 on the current SDELL-10 report numbers, Ms. Stucker first noted the slope in elementary school numbers and stated that this was due to the implementation of the WRUSD alternate model.

Ms. Stucker asked the Task Force for its approval of the WRUSD proposed alternate model.

Dr. Manus then spoke. She noted that, according to A.R.S. § 15-756.02, they (WRUSD) are entitled to propose an alternate plan, and they did so. Because this plan has not been approved and, as per Dr. Manus, they have not received a “clear and definite answer”, their district plans are undecided; “that is the reason we are here again today”.

She then again cited A.R.S. § 15-756.02,...”C. *On receipt of a proposed program from a school district or charter school, the task force may do one of the following:*

- 1. Approve the proposed program.*
- 2. Provide limited approval subject to specific stipulations prescribed by the state board.*
- 3. Reject the proposed program and identify a model approved by the task force for the school district or charter school to adopt.”*

Dr. Manus asked that the Task Force approve the WRUSD model, which takes into account the unique cultural and historical needs of Navajo ELLs.

Chairman Maguire asked that someone from WRUSD delineate the differences between the Task Force-approved model and the WRUSD alternate.

Ms. Stucker spoke for the group and replied that one main difference is that of mixing ELL students with non-ELL students of similar educational needs (by grade level) in the same classrooms. She noted that most of the district’s students have similar needs. She stated: “...some get identified as ELL, and some do not.” She noted that this is also very cost effective for the district, as they do not have to have a separate classroom and separate ELD teacher.

She stated that this alternate model keeps students in the same grade level with their peers.

Ms. Stucker noted a difference at the high school level. She stated: “...we are somewhat following the Phoenix UHSD model”. She noted that they are using the content area of science for reading for the current year, and economics/social studies for writing and grammar. If next year, they need to

do the four hours of instruction, they will use the dual-endorsed science teacher for writing and grammar.

For the middle school, Ms. Stucker noted that they do not have a two-hour English block this year (and last year), but will put that back in for next year. She noted that because of various factors (the teachers not having dual endorsements, limited number of English teachers, etc.), students have one hour of English and then one period at the end of the day called “EXCEL” (where students are brought back to their English teacher). Social studies, math and science classes are also used as ELD classes. Teachers have to document the number of minutes devoted to specific ELD areas.

Ms. Stucker noted that they did not originally present in this format, but in work with the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELAS), it was revised to what it is now. The only reason that certain parts of the Task Force-approved models were deleted by WRUSD, is that they were not part of a model. For example, she noted that needs might be very different next year as opposed to this. Ms. Stucker noted that perhaps this might have been better seen as an appendix instead of a model.

Ms. Stucker noted that WRUSD is providing four hours of ELL English instruction. According to Ms. Stucker, there is a bilingual program in the district; it is the Din’é Immersion (dual language) program. It is not associated with SEI.

Ms. Haver asked if students in the dual language program have the first language of English. Ms. Stucker answered in the affirmative. Ms. Haver further asked if any ELLs in the program had tested proficient and that this applied to all sections of the AZELLA test; again, Ms. Stucker replied yes, in all sections.

As per Ms. Stucker, WRUSD now uses the Primary Home Language Other Than English (PHLOTE) form only one time, at enrollment. There was further exchange between the two parties, with the final understanding that the Navajo language is used only at that school.

Ms. Merritt noted that in the WRUSD presentations, many had noted that classes clustered ELLs and non-ELLs of similar needs. She asked how WRUSD determined which students have similar needs, “...regardless of the AZELLA.” Dr. Manus answered that many non-labeled ELLs may need language services as much as students whose parents identified their children as PHLOTES. Ms. Merritt then asked what mechanism WRUSD is using to identify the non-ELLs (who have similar educational needs as the actual ELLs).

Ms. Tayah then noted that the ELLs are clustered with gifted students, creatively gifted, visual gifted, (critical thinking is utilized), and these students are the ones identified to work with ELLs.

Ms. Merritt then noted the advent of the one-question format on the PHLOTE form, and asked:...”will this resolve the situation...” to eliminate the confusion of those students identified or not identified as ELLs, etc. WRUSD stated that: ...”we’re very curious as to how our parents answer that...” Dr. Manus stated that should parents and grandparents ask if their children would be in a separate classroom that WRUSD would say “yes”.

Ms. Klein asked if the data was reclassification data. Ms. Stucker noted that the data reflects: “the number of ELL students left after testing from the year before.” Ms. Klein noted that: “...you can’t necessarily assume it’s your program affected here.”

Ms. Stucker was asked to clarify if these were the same students in the data, a one-for-one in-out as opposed to some new students, which would change the data perspective. Ms. Stucker said these were the same students, “like a little cohort...”

Chairman Maguire stated that this data did not reflect those students that were still not proficient, but not counted (for example those that were promoted or moved away). As he stated, “this is a gross change, not a net reclassification change”. Ms. Klein asked if such a report was available, and also for the total number of students enrolled per school.

Ms. Dugan asked that looking at their numbers for the incoming year, perhaps an ILLP would serve their purposes? Ms. Stucker noted that there is a problem with the “three-year span grade band”. Ms. Dugan acknowledged this, but said, “...for the most part”... the ILLP could be used and Ms. Stucker agreed.

Ms. Dugan noted Ms. Merritt’s comment on the one-question PHLOTE form was appropriate, and that ADE had heard specifically from the Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) with Native American populations, whose students spoke primarily English. “The primary home language for that child, is English...” and that is what ADE was responding to in producing the new form. Ms. Dugan noted that probably fewer kids would enter as ELL because of this form; Ms. Stucker agreed.

Then Ms. Dugan pointed out that the use of the ILLP, in conjunction with the new question, would give new Kindergarteners the benefit of the situation, and really take care of the WRUSD question. Ms. Stucker agreed but noted that it would be a little different with students already in the system.

Chairman Maguire commented that more time and effort were devoted to understanding the WRUSD alternate model than any other, to the extent that he himself had charted out a point-by-point comparison of the WRUSD Alternate model and the Task Force-approved model. He also noted that this was the third time that WRUSD had presented and that the written presentation has never matched the spoken presentation. He pointed out that this is what:...”led to confusion in the past; we couldn’t quite figure out what you were doing...”

Chairman Maguire noted that now what is clear from this WRUSD presentation, is that what is occurring in the high schools is different than what is happening in the middle and elementary schools. He noted that this wasn’t clear before.

To better understand the WRUSD alternate model, he then said that he would delineate the five differences between the WRUSD and the Task Force-approved models:

1. Permit ELLs to be mixed in classes with non-ELLs of similar language proficiencies,
2. Would prefer not to use grade bands,
3. Use of academic course material as an alternative to the reading component (with a specifically-identified language objective), (like the Task Force-approved Phoenix UHSD alternate model) at the elementary school-level. Chairman Maguire noted that this is in the

WRUSD Alternate Model, Page 6: “Insert D1-Previously adopted alternate model language: ELL students who have a composite score of Intermediate on AZELLA may receive part of the Reading portion of their ELD program in an ELD class that utilizes social studies, math or science textual materials provided that the curriculum specifies a specifically identified ELP language objective, utilizing a DSI skill, and uses content-based texts that are at grade and proficiency-appropriate levels.”

Chairman Maguire noted that the changes were at the elementary school level, the addition of math as a permitted academic alternative, and limited HQ requirements. Ms. Stucker said that was an error on the WRUSD alternate model, and it should reflect middle school (not elementary). The WRUSD representatives strongly stated that they wanted to be sure and alter this alternate model language to correctly reflect middle school (not elementary school).

4. Changing scheduling and time allocations for middle and high schools:
  - Expand use of other materials to all four hours (all four subject areas of the ELD program-not just reading),
  - Expand student inclusion in this strategy to all students (not just those scoring Intermediate on the AZELLA),
  - Add math as a permitted textual material,
  - Only lead teacher of a team would be HQ; not all teachers. Ms Dugan asked why this dual-certified didn't teach the four hours. Ms. Begay noted that the schedule could not be modified during the semester. Ms. Dugan stated that this would be the district's “best bet – best of all possible worlds”.

Ms. Merritt expressed concern with the grammar piece being “farmed out” to a content class, and noted that her district's reading scores have markedly improved since they have taught grammar overtly. She asked if WRUSD students are proficient in on the AZELLA sub-test of writing, so they don't need that hour of ELD and can mainstream for that time?

Ms. Stucker noted that this was due to their understanding all students were instructed in four hours of ELD. Chairman Maguire clarified that this was the case. This is “Year One” in regards to model implementation and all ELL students are “first year students”; as required by law, all “first year” students require the full four hours of ELD instruction. He noted that looking forward to next year, a...”substantial number of your students will be second year students.”

- High school students would receive two hours of English language arts, one hour of ELD/reading-based content and last focus would then be on the writing/grammar portion. Then eligible students (those that score proficient on the reading, writing sub-test on the AZELLA, could forego that hour of ELD and mainstream for that hour.
- Middle school students would receive one hour of English language arts (ELA), one hour of “Excel” (focusing on AIMS, returning to the ELA teacher). Chairman Maguire interjected and asked if this was actually an “AIMS-prep” class. Ms. Begay noted that this was a grammar and language/academic vocabulary class for AIMS. This was asked again, and confirmed. Accounting for hours three and four, the

students would receive one hour of ELD/reading-based social studies content and one hour of writing-based science content. Chairman Maguire clarified that they would have four discrete blocks. He noted that, like the high school ELLs, those that tested proficient on the AZELLA sub-test, could likewise forego that hour of ELD. WRUSD emphasized that math is not included in the content; this is only either science or social studies.

5. Middle and High School Teacher Qualifications: Ms. Begay clarified earlier testimony; all team teachers in 6A, 7A and 8A (ELL-student class designations) are HQ, with the ESL, BLE or SEI endorsements. All teachers at the middle school are HQ/ELD endorsed, whether they teach ELLs or not. Ms. Dugan noted that Ms. Begay said that ELL-team teachers are HQ/ELD endorsed, and asked if that also included those content-area teachers who work with ELLs. Ms. Begay acknowledged that these content teachers were not also HQ in ELA. Ms. Dugan noted that this was the difference. Ms. Merritt clarified that all team leaders are HQ/ELD-endorsed.

Chairman Maguire clarified the following for WRUSD high school:

- They have two hours of ELA, one hour of ELD-based social studies, and one hour of writing/grammar in the “EXCEL-AIMS” class (the only issue at the current time is to take this last hour out of the science content area where it is housed).
- They will check data to see which ELL students have tested proficient on the reading/writing sub-test,
- They will look at the issue of the writing/grammar class.

Chairman Maguire stated that with these issues clarified/corrected, WRUSD would be in compliance (at the high school level) with the Task Force-approved models).

In middle school, Chairman Maguire noted that (assuming the “EXCEL-AIMS” class is a grammar/writing class), there is only one issue. That is the ELA qualification of their social studies teacher who teaches reading. He also noted that while in some schools, ILLPs are/will be implemented, the mixing of ELLs/non-ELL in SEI classrooms also remains in question.

Ms. Merritt stated that: “The numbers are moving in the right direction, the plan is pretty close, we don’t know what’s going to happen with your numbers based on the new PHLOTE question, and you are getting very close to the grade level bands...” She noted that with the foregoing, it would behoove WRUSD to work with the ADE for one year. This was echoed by Ms. Tayah, who noted that they would try to adapt the WRUSD program, look at areas still in need, work with ADE, and try to bring it closer to compliance with the Task Force-approved model.

Dr. Manus extended an invitation to ADE to visit WRUSD, and noted that they have done so in the past.

Ms. Rosas also suggested that in WRUSD data collection, charts should be presented by grade level/comparing ELL students to total enrollment.

Ms. Dugan noted that in a previous similar scenario, the Task Force recommended that the district continue to work with ADE. She further noted that with the end-of-year, compiling data, and the new PHLOTE question, many concerns would be a moot point. She urged WRUSD to work with ADE/John Stollar and noted that he works closely with the districts. Ms. Dugan noted that another



alternate model would be unnecessary, especially since they are so close to compliance; she felt that judicious use of ILLPs and with the new PHLOTE question, WRUSD will be “right there”.

Dr. Garcia noted this was a good suggestion, and asked if Ms. Dugan would make a motion to that effect. Ms. Dugan moved: “WRUD will continue to work with the OELAS division at the ADE to come into compliance with the models that have already been established by the Task Force, and continue that discussion, and have a working relationship until WRUSD does come into compliance.” Ms. Rosas seconded the motion.

Dr. Garcia noted all the unique variables of WRUSD. He noted therefore, that they should not be discouraged from possibly presenting an alternate mode in the future.

Motion passed unanimously. Chairman Maguire acknowledged the unique needs of WRUSD’s student population, their community and challenges; he also praised their work and continued cooperation with ADE.

### **Update on Arizona Department of Education Activities Regarding Implementation of the Structured English Immersion Models**

This was presented by Adela Santa Cruz, Director of Program Effectiveness in the Office of English Acquisition Services in the ADE.

Ms. Santa Cruz reported on two areas of major concern to the ADE and the Task Force.

The first – Monitoring:

- a. This includes program compliance, model implementation, Corrective Action follow-ups, and the full Title III monitoring of ELL programs.
- b. Monitoring for the ’08-’09 school year has been completed. ADE monitoring covered over 90 on-site Local Educational Agency (LEA) visits. In addition,

The second – Training:

- a. Round II-B and C, which will be offered in the summer, is structured around the methodologies of SEI.
- b. These will be conducted at ADE; Ms. Santa Cruz cited this location as the most cost-effective method of delivery. ADE is unable to travel to the districts due to budgetary constraints. ADE will offer a number of trainings, and in fact, they are rapidly reaching capacity. They should be done by September’s end.
- c. In addition, for a number of districts that have not been trained, they are entering into agreements with ADE to structure a system to help them train others in their district. This is a particular help with districts’ new teachers.
- d. ADE is also planning for future training, beginning with an analysis of what has taken place, what exists in place and future objectives.

Dr. Garcia asked what the new training will cover; is it training for new teachers or enhanced training, “what is the layout?” Ms. Santa Cruz noted that the training has been offered in the past to

the “top 20” districts (in terms of ELL counts), and they are now offering this presentation to smaller districts and charters. In addition, there is a smaller Round II-A training session offered for teachers newly reassigned to ELL teaching, new teachers, or charter schools.

Dr. Garcia then asked what the total count is that will be trained. Ms. Santa Cruz noted that it is the goal of ADE to have at least two people in every school district and charter school trained in ELD. She also stated that ADE will contact any districts that do not have any personnel trained, with the goal of entering into a training agreement, so that, ultimately, every district will have the capacity to train in-house, as well as attend ADE training. ADE is trying to “touch, if you will, with those strategies, every school district, every charter school in the state”.

Dr. Garcia asked how many are served at each training session. Ms. Santa Cruz said the maximum allowed is 40. She pointed out that initially, districts and charters are asked to send no more than two people.

Dr. Garcia said that the background of his question is to assess the effectiveness of these models, and that training is an important prerequisite of the model implementation Dr. Garcia asked for Ms. Santa Cruz to project, “at what point do you think we will be able to ask that question; these models do or do not work on the basis of their implementation and training?” Ms. Santa Cruz noted that “we are already seeing changes out there.” She further stated that, anecdotally, ADE is getting back very positive comments from the field when teachers are using ELD and that they are seeing changes in their students. Also, she noted that the data that ADE will be receiving later on reclassification will be the final proof.

Dr. Garcia noted that Ms. Santa Cruz gave the impression that she felt strongly about the training and its positive impact on teachers and model implementation. She concurred.

Chairman Maguire asked Ms. Santa Cruz to provide details on the “summer academy”. She clarified the title – “*High Intensity Summer ELD Program (HISEP)*” – and that it involves six districts.

- a. These districts have volunteered to use their summer programs,
- b. It is focused on Intermediate-level ELLs,
- c. It is 20 days long, six hours a day,
- d. The focus will be high-powered, intensive ELD strategies,
- e. This is specifically designed to take students that “are stuck on the Intermediate level” focused “deliberate delivery” of ELD instruction to take them through to proficiency,
- f. ELD will be on grammar, reading, writing and conversational usage, using the “Language Star” (phonology, morphology, semantics, lexicon, and vocabulary),
- g. Each class size will be between 15-20 students,
- h. Each district will have six sections, and one teacher per section (totaling 36 teachers)
- i. ADE is looking forward to the post-test at the end of the 20 days, to see if students can go through to mainstream

Ms. Haver, asked what grade levels are involved; and Ms. Santa Cruz noted that these students are from grades 2-8. This closed her presentation

Ms. Merritt (the ELL Coordinator of Glendale Union High School District [GUHSD]) stated that using the district's Task Force-approved Alternate model, 62% of the total ELL students (in the model) have been reclassified. She noted that sophomores were inadvertently included in the model; of those, 71% have been reclassified. Ms. Merritt said that no sophomores will be in the model in the coming school year.

Ms. Haver asked if she was correct, that in the past, GUHSD had a reclassification rate of 11-12%. Ms. Merritt, noting that was not the case, that GUHSD has always met their federal Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). In fact the GUHSD reclassification rate last year was approximately 20%.

### **Call to the Public**

Comments were offered from Mr. Rafael Ortiz from Stevenson Elementary.

He noted his address in Douglas, Arizona (1201 East Fairway Drive), and that he is the principal at Stevenson Elementary School.

Mr. Ortiz noted that there was a problem that had created division in the town. He stated that, "all the problems, in my opinion", were caused by the ADE monitoring visit that had occurred in February. He said that the findings were not for non-compliance, "but due to deficiencies in the training and administration". He noted that at Stevenson most parents [of ELL students] opted out of the SEI program, and further, that there is nothing in law that provides districts with any recourse when this occurs. He also stated that when this occurs, said students are no longer ELLs, and no longer in the program.

Further, Mr. Ortiz, discussed the monitoring letter from Ms. Gilbreath (Leann Gilbreath, OELAS Director of Monitoring), and commended her expertise and competency. He read from the letter, "It was important for our office to communicate with the district that one school, Stevenson, placed the district in Corrective Action." Mr. Ortiz then said that this caused his removal from school, and assignment to home duty, "suspension with pay". He said that the report was published in the Douglas paper, with the headline "Stevenson ELL Program Under Investigation by the State". He noted that this was "above the fold".

Mr. Ortiz stated that most of the findings in the monitoring report were not of non-compliance. He read from the letter, "Mr. Ortiz had unauthorized meetings with the parents". He noted that this inferred that, "Meetings to explain this program to the parents were unauthorized". He then noted that there were eleven other points in the letter, with the last having "eight or nine" sub-points.

He stated that the issue "did not end there" and that the school board then conducted an investigation, with the superintendent being suspended. Mr. Ortiz noted that perhaps Ms. Gilbreath's comments had been "used" by people with agendas. He then stated that, "the monitoring was not really objective." He then stated that, "The reason I am here today is to ask the Task Force to clarify the law, to instruct or to train the monitors or establish", what actions should be taken in situation such as he outlined earlier.

Mr. Ortiz stated that some board members have made statements to the effect that, “parents may not make decisions on their children’s education”. He said this was a, “serious problem in Douglas, the board is divided and the community is talking about a recall. It is very serious.” He again asked that the Task Force provide guidelines and clarification on this issue, and that someone from ADE travel to Douglas USD to, “clarify this situation”, and said he would be glad to reply to any Task Force questions.

Chairman Maguire then noted that the rules of the open meeting laws prohibit questions on their part to “Call to the Public” comments, but thanked him for his comments.

### **Presentation and Discussion of Upcoming Task Force Activities**

Chairman Maguire noted that although there is a June Task Force meeting scheduled, but that the next likely meeting is the one to be held in July.

**Mr. DiCello moved, seconded by Ms. Dugan, that the meeting adjourn. The motion carried.**

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

---

**Alan Maguire**  
Chairman  
English Language Learner Task Force

---

Date